



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/599,475	06/22/2000	Young-Jin Kim	11349-P65689US0	7953

136 7590 10/06/2003

JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC
400 SEVENTH STREET N.W.
SUITE 600
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER

GARLAND, STEVEN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2125

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

7

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/599,475

Applicant(s)

KIM, YOUNG-JIN

Examiner

Steven R Garland

Art Unit

2125

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears in the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/22/00, 4/18/01, 2/26/02, 7/23/03.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 June 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3,4,5,6.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 3-7, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 3, lines 5 and 7, " the light " lacks a clear antecedent basis and it is also unclear as to which condition the light represents. Claim 10 has a similar problem.

Claim 5 contains the trademark/trade name Ethernet and Xerox. Where a trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. See *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the goods themselves. Thus, a trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the trademark or trade name. In the present case, the trademark/trade name is used to identify/describe a data communication networks and, accordingly, the identification/description is indefinite.

The remaining claims fall with the parent claims.

Art Unit: 2125

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. 6,473,664 in view of Shigematsu et al. 5,432,715.

Lee et al. teaches a factory automation system for processing wafer cassettes; use of servers; checking whether a server is normal or not; use of various communication schemes; use of databases; use of an AGV and stocker. See the abstract; figures; col. 1, lines 14-35; col. 2, lines 43-62; col. 3, lines 61-65; col. 4, line 60 on. Also note col. 7, lines 8-9; col. 9, lines 7-10; col. 11, lines 8-17.

Lee however does not teach monitoring the status of the computer (cpu) or memory or display the status.

Shigematsu et al. (cited by applicant) teaches storing information in real time; monitoring the status of the processor, job status, network status, hardware status and also for various types of failures. Shigematsu also teaches displaying critical faults along with other monitored conditions in various areas of the display. See the abstract; figures; col. 1, lines 6-20; col. 1, line 60 to col. 2, line 64; col. 5, line 24 to col. 6, line 24; col. 9, line 52 to col. 10, line 40.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lee in view of Shigematsu and monitor the status of the servers so that abnormal conditions and

Art Unit: 2125

status of the various components could be monitored and faults quickly corrected or prevented.

Lee and Shigematsu however do not specifically mention determining the availability of a disk.

Richardson teaches monitoring and displaying the status of various components of a server such as the processor status and disk status. See col. 1, line 62 to col. 2, line 53.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lee and Shigematsu in view of Richardson and monitor the processor and disk status as particular hardware components to be monitored and displayed. This would allow faults or potential faults in the hardware to be corrected or prevented.

Lee, Shigematsu, and Richardson do not specifically mention the use Ethernet, but Lee does teach that the system can be adapted to be used with various types of communication schemes such as a star network. See col. 11, lines 8-18, of Lee.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lee, Shigematsu, and Richardson in view of the express teaching of Lee and to use an Ethernet communication scheme to implement the star network.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven R Garland whose telephone number is 703-305-9759. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 to 5:00.

Art Unit: 2125

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo Picard, can be reached on (703) 308-0538. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-3900.

SP-6

Steven R Garland
Examiner
Art Unit 2125

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'L. Picard', with a stylized flourish at the end.

LEO PICARD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100